
Appendix J

Performance Reports

This appendix provides instructions for preparing performance reports for professional service consultants. The purpose of the reports is to have a clear understanding of how well the firm is meeting the agreement requirements. The completed forms may also be used during the shortlisting and selection processes.

An interim report may be submitted at anytime it is deemed appropriate, but should be prepared annually and at the completion of major phases. An interim report is an excellent way of conveying to a firm the Department's assessment of its current performance while work is still under way.

A final report must be prepared no later than the final invoice. Only one final report is to be submitted per agreement. A copy of this report is to be submitted to the Consultant Control Coordinator for use in the shortlisting and selection process.

Two report forms are provided: one for construction management and inspection contracts and one for all other contracts. Both forms are used in evaluating the performance of firms performing professional services for the Department.

REPORT PREPARATION

The questions of the two forms differ somewhat to better evaluate the types of services required. Separate guidelines for making the evaluations are provided. Both forms are completed using the following instructions.

Place an "X" in the appropriate box indicating the reporting status: interim, annual, or final. Complete the remaining portion of the form headings. The description need not be detailed but should include the primary type of work being performed under the terms of the contract. For interim reports, the major type of work being performed during that reporting period should be indicated. For open-end contracts with multiple projects, performance reports are required only for the overall master contract, not for individual projects.

Raters are encouraged to provide comments to explain ratings, especially for above- or below-average ratings.

NON-CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

Performance Report Guidelines

For questions 1 through 10, place an “X” in the appropriate box.

QUESTION 1—TECHNICAL CAPABILITY

Poor Technical capability of personnel assigned to the project was generally unsatisfactory.

Satisfactory Technical capability was average or generally satisfactory.

Good Technical capability was generally above average or outstanding.

QUESTION 2—STAFF STABILITY

Poor Personnel, particularly the Project Manager, frequently changed.

Satisfactory Normally expected reassignments, retirements, etc.

Good Original team remained as selected.

QUESTION 3—SUPERVISION

Poor Supervision of personnel and assignment of resources was lacking with respect to keeping on track at minimum cost. Technical personnel, required resources or support staff were directed, assigned or reassigned improperly by the firm's management, failure to support Project Manager.

Satisfactory Supervision, assignment of personnel and resources was average.

Good Supervision, assignment of personnel and support of Project Manager was above average.

QUESTION 4—CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

Poor Mix of necessary and qualified personnel, financial/budgetary items, use of person-hours inadequately managed.

Satisfactory Mix of personnel, financial/budgetary items, use of person-hours managed with few problems.

Good Project performed on time and within budget.

QUESTION 5—QUALITY CONTROL

Poor Internal quality control system does not exist or functions improperly.

Satisfactory Internal quality control system exists and functions properly.

Good Product submissions show obvious evidence of accuracy, compliance and completeness requiring little correction.

QUESTION 6—COOPERATION

- Poor The firm did not work closely with the Department, keeping it aware of progress and problems encountered.
- Satisfactory The firm worked closely with the Department.
- Good The firm worked very closely with the Department, keeping it aware of progress and any anticipated problems, and either resolved them or recommended solutions

QUESTION 7—COORDINATION

- Poor The firm failed to properly coordinate with others, resulting in delay, budgetary problems and antagonism toward the firm and/or Department.
- Satisfactory The firm properly coordinated with others, with no subsequent delays, budgetary problems or antagonism.
- Good The firm coordinated closely with others, anticipating problems and resolving them ahead of time.

QUESTION 8—ATTITUDE

- Poor The project team and/or management was unmotivated and indifferent toward the project, with no particular commitment to completing the work on schedule and/or within budget.
- Satisfactory The project team and/or management attitude toward the project was satisfactory, with commitment to completing the work on schedule and/or within budget.
- Good The firm's attitude toward the project was enthusiastic, with a commitment to completing the work ahead of schedule. For reasons beyond the firm's control, work may not have been completed ahead of schedule, but the firm indicated by its actions that was its goal.

QUESTION 9—QUALITY OF PRODUCTS

- Poor The quality and/or accuracy of work products submitted was below acceptable standards.
- Satisfactory The quality and/or accuracy of work products submitted was acceptable and met Department standards.
- Good The quality and/or accuracy of work products exceeded Department standards with only minor corrections needed.

QUESTION 10—COMPLETENESS OF SUBMISSIONS

- Poor Submissions to the Department were incomplete and may not have been on time.
- Satisfactory Submissions were complete and on time.
- Good Submissions were complete and accurate, with adequate backup documentation, and may

have been submitted ahead of schedule. Little or no corrective action was required.

QUESTION 11—WORK COMPLETED ON TIME?

Indicate if the work was completed and submitted on time.

QUESTION 12—IF NOT, WHY NOT?

Answer this question only if the answer to Question 11 is “No.”

QUESTIONS 13 & 14—ADDITIONAL REIMBURSEMENT REQUESTED?

Indicate if the firm requested additional reimbursement for extra work or perceived extra work. Explain if the request was justified.

QUESTION 15—WAS FEE WITHIN ORIGINAL AGREEMENT?

Indicate if the total fee paid or due the firm exceeded the original agreement amount.

QUESTION 16—IF NOT, WHAT WAS THE REASON?

If the answer to Number 15 is “No,” explain whether the overruns could have been controlled by the firm.

QUESTION 17—PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

The Project Manager, or other knowledgeable individual, should indicate an overall rating of the firm's performance, with remarks as appropriate.

After the form has been prepared, by the person assigned to administer the agreement, it is discussed with the Section Head, the appropriate Director, if necessary, and with representatives of the firm. The firm's Project Manager and/or Managing Principal should sign in the proper space, acknowledging that they have read the report and discussed it with the Department. It may be necessary that a meeting be scheduled to discuss the report. There may be some firms which refuse to sign the report, particularly if it is not favorable. In this case, either in Item 17 (Performance Summary Remarks) or following the space for signatures by the firm, place the following certification: “I certify that representatives of the firm have refused to sign this report.” This certification is to be followed by the Director's signature. The instructions are part of the form and are to be made available to the firm during their review.

**DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
TITLE 29 CHAPTER 69**

INTERIM ☐

ANNUAL ☐

FINAL ☐

Date

Section

Federal Aid No.

Agreement No.

State Contract No.

Consultant

Project Description

Prepared by

Organization and Management

1. Technical Capability of Personnel

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

2. Stability of Project Team

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

3. Adequacy of Supervision

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

4. Contract Administration

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

5. Quality Control

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

Cooperation and Coordination

6. Cooperation with Department

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

7. Coordination with Agencies, etc.

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

8. Attitude toward Project

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

Work Performance

9. Technical Quality of Products

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

10. Completeness of Submissions

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

11. Was work completed on time?

YES	NO

12. If No. 11, is NO, was it the fault of the Consultant?

Explain:

13. Did Consultant request additional reimbursement for extra work?

YES	NO

14. If No. 13 is YES, explain the reason for the request and if it was justified.

15. Was fee within original agreement amount?

YES	NO

16. If No. 15. is NO, was the increase due to a change in scope, complexity or duration directed by the Department or causes beyond the control of the Consultant?

Explain:

17. Performance

Summary

Remarks:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Project Manager _____ Date

Section Head _____ Date

FIRMFIRMFIRM

I/We acknowledge that I/We have read this report and have discussed it with the Department.

Project Manager _____ Date

Principal _____ Date

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION

This form is used in evaluating the performance of firms providing professional services for the Department in the fields of construction management or inspection. The form is completed similarly to the form for non-construction projects.

Performance Report Guidelines

For questions 1 through 10, place an "X" in the appropriate box.

QUESTION 1—TECHNICAL CAPABILITY

- Poor Technical capability of personnel assigned to the project was not appropriate for the contractor's operations or was generally unsatisfactory.
- Satisfactory Technical capability was average or generally satisfactory.
- Good Technical capability was generally above average or outstanding.

QUESTION 2—STAFF STABILITY

- Poor Base staff personnel, particularly the Chief Inspector, frequently changed.
- Satisfactory Only changes were normally expected reassignments, retirements, etc.
- Good Original team remained as selected.

QUESTION 3—SUPERVISION AND CORPORATE SUPPORT

- Poor Supervision of personnel and assignment of additional support staff and physical resources were lacking with respect to keeping project on schedule. Personnel, required resources or support staff were directed, assigned or reassigned improperly by the firm's management, failure to support Chief Inspector.
- Satisfactory Supervision, assignment of personnel and resources was average.
- Good Supervision, assignment of personnel and support of Project Manager was above average.

QUESTION 4—CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION AND PROCEDURES

- Poor Limited demonstrated knowledge of Department construction administration and procedures. Considerable difficulty in meeting contract requirements without intensive direction.
- Satisfactory Demonstrated knowledge of construction administration and procedures. Little difficulty in meeting contract requirements with minimum direction.
- Good Excellent knowledge of construction administration and procedures. Staff was self-starting, rarely requiring Department staff instruction or correction.

QUESTION 5—QUALITY CONTROL

Poor	Legibility, neatness, organization, and format lacking, with errors; incomplete or inadequate progress records, material delivery records, material field performance tests, labor records, production records, and “as-built plans”; generally poor documentation, record keeping, and inspection.
Satisfactory	Acceptable quality documentation, record keeping, and inspection.
Good	Product records, documentation, and in-place product show obvious evidence of accuracy, compliance and completeness.

QUESTION 6—COOPERATION

Poor	The inspection team did not work closely with the Department, keeping it aware of progress and problems encountered.
Satisfactory	The inspection team worked closely with the Department .
Good	The firm worked very closely with the Department, keeping it aware of progress and any anticipated problems, either resolving them or recommending solutions.

QUESTION 7—COORDINATION

Poor	The staff failed to properly coordinate with others, resulting in delays in phasing or project completion, contractor claims, delay and danger to the public, and antagonism toward the Contractor or Department.
Satisfactory	The firm properly coordinated with others, with no significant delays or claims.
Good	The firm coordinated closely with others, anticipating problems and resolving them ahead of time.

QUESTION 8—ATTITUDE

Poor	The project team and/or management was unmotivated and indifferent toward the project, with no particular commitment to completing the work on schedule, in accordance with plans, in conformance with specifications or in a workman-like manner.
Satisfactory	The project team and/or management attitude toward the project was satisfactory, with commitment to complete the work on schedule, with acceptable conformance to plans, specifications and in-place performance.
Good	The firm's attitude toward the project was enthusiastic, with a commitment to complete the work ahead of schedule, conforming to plans, specifications and excellent in-place performance. For reasons beyond the Consultant's control, the Contractor may not have completed phases or the project ahead of schedule, but the firm had indicated by its actions that was its goal.

QUESTION 9—QUALITY OF PRODUCTS

- Poor The quality and/or accuracy of work products submitted was below acceptable standards.
- Satisfactory The quality and/or accuracy of work products submitted was acceptable and met Department standards.
- Good The quality and/or accuracy of work products exceeded Department standards, with only minor corrections needed.

QUESTION 10—COMPLETENESS OF WORK

- Poor Were incomplete and may not have been on time.
- Satisfactory Submissions were complete and on time.
- Good Submissions were complete and accurate, with adequate backup documentation, and may have been submitted ahead of schedule. Little or no corrective action was required.

QUESTION 11—PROJECT COMPLETED ON TIME

Indicate if the project was completed on time. Did the Consultant submit the final estimate within the required time to avoid interest payments to the Contractor?

QUESTION 12—IF NOT, WHY NOT?

Answer this question only if the answer to Question 12 was “No.”

QUESTIONS 13 & 14—ADDITIONAL REIMBURSEMENT REQUESTED?

Indicate if the firm requested additional reimbursement for extra work or perceived extra work. Explain if the request was justified.

QUESTIONS 15 & 16—CONTRACTOR CLAIMS FILED?

Did the Contractor file any claims? If yes, were the claims attributable to errors or negligence on the part of the Consultant?

QUESTION 17—PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

The Project Manager or other knowledgeable individual should indicate an overall rating of the firm's performance, with remarks as may be appropriate.

After the form has been prepared by the Inspector in Charge, it is discussed with the Area Engineer, the appropriate District Engineer, if necessary, and with representatives of the firm. The firm's Chief Inspector and/or Managing Principal should sign in the proper space, acknowledging that they have read the report and discussed it with the Department. It may be necessary that a meeting be scheduled to discuss the report. There may be some firms which refuse to sign the report, particularly if it is not favorable. In this case, either in Item 15 (Performance Summary Remarks) or following the space for signatures by the firm, place the following certification: “I certify that representatives of the Firm have refused to sign this report.” This certification is to be followed by the Director's signature. The instructions are part of the form and are to be made available to the firm during their review.

**DELAWARE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PERFORMANCE REPORT FOR
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
TITLE 29 CHAPTER 69**

CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT/INSPECTION

INTERIM ☐
ANNUAL ☐
FINAL ☐

Date

Section

Federal Aid No.

Agreement No.

State Contract No.

Consultant

Project

Description

Prepared by:

Organization and Management

1. Technical Capability of Assigned Personnel

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

2. Stability of Inspection Team

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

3. Adequacy of Supervision and Corporate Support

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

4. Knowledge of Contract Administration Procedures

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

5. Quality Control

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

Cooperation and Coordination

6. Cooperation with Department

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

7. Coordination with contractor, utilities, regulatory agencies, etc.

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

8. Attitude toward Project

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

Work Performance

9. Quality of Products

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

10. Completeness of Work

BELOW AVERAGE	SATISFACTORY	ABOVE AVERAGE

Comments:

11. Was project completed on time?

YES	NO

12. If No. 11, is NO, was it the fault of the Consultant ?

Explain:

13. Did Consultant request additional reimbursement for extra work?

YES	NO

14. If No. 13 is YES, explain the reason for the request and if it was justified.

15. Did Contractor file any claims?

YES	NO

16. If No. 15 was YES, explain the reason for the claim. Was it the fault of the Consultant?

17. Performance

Summary

Remarks:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Inspector in Charge _____ Date

Area Engineer _____ Date

FIRMFIRMFIRM

I/We acknowledge that I/we have read this report and have discussed it with the Department.

Project Manager _____ **Date**

Principal _____ **Date**